

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-10 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 5, and 8 have been amended to correct the informalities. Applicant therefore submits that claims 1-10 are in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

As to the art rejection, claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Schuster (U.S. Patent No. 6,731,630) in view of Waites (U.S. Patent No. 6,788,769). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

For example, amended claim 1 calls for:

a plurality of communication devices for inputting a telephone number that includes an identification number of a telecommunication services operator and for transmitting electronic mail information together with the telephone number;

and further calls for:

a communication management device for receiving the transmitted electronic mail information and telephone number, for reading the domain name of the telecommunication services operator from the reference table using the identification number of the telecommunication services operator, for merging the telephone number with the domain name read from the reference table to form an electronic mail address, and for forwarding the electronic mail information to the electronic mail address[.] (Emphasis added.)

Neither the relied on sections of Schuster nor the relied on sections of Waites disclose or suggest a communication device for transmitting electronic mail information together with the telephone number. Moreover, neither the relied on sections of

Schuster nor the relied on sections of Waites disclose or suggest a communication management device for receiving the transmitted electronic mail information and telephone number, neither the relied on sections of Schuster nor the relied on sections of Waites disclose or suggest a communication management device for reading the domain name of the telecommunication services operator from the reference table, and neither the relied on sections of Schuster nor the relied on sections of Waites disclose or suggest a communication management device for forwarding the electronic mail information to the electronic mail address.

Rather, the relied on sections of Schuster describe that after a telephone receives a user entered communication number, the telephone queries a database server. (See col.18 11.13-19.) The relied on sections of the patent do not disclose or suggest that the telephone transmits the user entered communication number to a communication management device, and the relied on sections of the patent do not disclose or suggest that a communication management device queries the database.

Further, the relied on sections of Schuster describe that the telephone then places a call to the desired party. Namely, the telephone forwards the electronic mail information to the electronic mail address. The relied on sections of the reference neither disclose nor suggest that a communication management device forwards the the electronic mail information to the electronic mail address.

The relied on sections of Waites do not remedy the deficiencies of the relied on sections of Schuster.

It follows, for at least the reasons described above, that neither the relied on sections of Schuster nor the relied on sections of Waites, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the communication system set out in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and each is distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 5 is directed to a communication device that includes:

a storage unit for storing a reference table in which the identification number of the telecommunication services operator is correlated to the domain name of the telecommunication services operator[.] (Emphasis added.)

Neither the relied on sections of Schuster nor the relied on sections of Waites disclose or suggest that a communication unit stores a reference table.

As described above, the relied on sections of Schuster describe that a telephone queries a database server. The relied on sections of the patent do not disclose or suggest that the telephone includes a storage unit for storing such a database.

The relied on sections of Waites do not remedy the deficiencies of the relied on sections of Schuster.

It follows that neither the relied on sections of Schuster nor the relied on sections of Waites, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the communication system set out in claim 5 for at least the reasons described above. Therefore, claim 5 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Claims 6-7 depend from claim 5 and, for at least the same reasons, each is distinguishable over the cited references.

Independent claim 8 includes limitations similar to those set out in the above excerpt of claim 1. Claim 8 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of Schuster and Waites at least for the same reasons.

Claims 9-10 depend from claim 8 and each is distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 103 and 112, first paragraph.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: July 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Lawrence E. Russ  
Lawrence E. Russ  
Registration No.: 35,342  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

764397\_1.DOC